DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 442 767 SP 039 293

AUTHOR	Silva, Diane Yendol
TITLE	Teachers' Work and Ethos: An Ethnographic Case Study of the Work Lives of Teachers in an Inquiry-Oriented Professional Development School.
PUB DATE	2000-04-28
NOTE	44p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 24-28, 2000).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	Case Studies; College School Cooperation; *Cooperating Teachers; Elementary Education; Elementary School Teachers; Higher Education; *Inquiry; Internship Programs; Mentors; *Professional Development Schools; Student Development; Student Teachers; *Teacher Role

ABSTRACT

This study investigated how six mentor teachers understood and negotiated their roles as mentors in an elementary professional development school (PDS). Data were collected over 18 months from mentor and intern journals, field notes, interviews, e-mails, meeting minutes, and transcripts from PDS meetings. Each teacher participated in interviews regarding their motivation and teacher education experiences, experiences as mentors within the PDS, and thoughts associated with problems and possibilities of the PDS. Results are discussed according to three PDS phases. In the first phase, teachers were not committed to the renewal piece of the vision and were not always comfortable using their voices, though they often silenced their colleagues to protect their established ways of doing business. In the second phase, teachers' work changed in meaningful ways as they incorporated interns into the classroom. Teachers grew professionally as they dialogued with interns. The mentor role broadened to include beginning teacher educators. In the third phase, mentors engaged in some form of inquiry, seeking to understand what inquiry was and how it was part of their work. They used observation as a tool for understanding inquiry and began to recognize inquiry as a professional development tool for interns. (Contains 26 references.) (SM)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

RUNNING HEAD: TEACHERS' WORK AND ETHOS

SCOPE OF INTEREST NOTICE
The ERIC Facility has assigned this document for processing to: SP
In our judgment, this document is also of interest to the Clearinghouses noted to the right. Indexing should reflect their special points of view. TM

ED 442 767

TEACHERS' WORK AND ETHOS: AN ETHNOGRAPHIC CASE STUDY OF THE WORK LIVES OF TEACHERS IN AN INQUIRY-ORIENTED PROFESSIONAL DEVELOPMENT SCHOOL

Diane Yendol Silva

The Pennsylvania State University

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Paper Presented at AERA

New Orleans, LO

April, 2000

SP039283

D. Y. Silva

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)
☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.
☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.
• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

> We had spent over a year working with teachers to create a PDS and the process, although exhilarating and challenging, had taken on dimensions that we had never anticipated. Additionally, the work was not where we had hoped it would be. We were impatient. In responding to our frustration, we were asked by a friend, "*It sounds as if you are disappointed by multiple agendas at* the school... and by teachers' reluctance to look deeply into their own practices ... am I close? It also sounds as if after a year of working your heart out, you feel a "community of inquiry" is no closer than when you started." Our friend was right. In a sense, we were hoping to tell a story that was a part of the rhetoric of the current reform movement but not yet a part of the reality of these teachers' work. So what story could we tell. Deciding which story to tell required us to refocus on our friend's question. What are we learning about how teachers experience their *first year* in this PDS?

The literature suggests that PDSs have the potential to develop an inquiry oriented culture and offer promise to teachers interested in meaningful participation in the issues and practice of educational reform. According to Darling-Hammond (1994), creating infinitely skilled teachers may be the key to successful educational reform. Infinitely skilled teachers participate in inquiry by observing their own students, questioning their current practices, posing engaging questions, recognizing challenges, monitoring progress, and adjusting practices to meet the needs of their students (Darling-Hammond,1998). Unfortunately, even in light of the abundance of educational reform efforts, these characteristics have not flourished in the traditional culture of schooling (Fullan, 1991; Hargreaves, 1994; Lortie, 1975).

In an effort to build a new culture of professional learning within schools that will better meet the unique needs of today's students, many educators have advocated the creation of PDSs (Darling-Hammond, 1994; Levine, 1997). In fact, almost every commission and report on teacher education (Goodlad, 1990; Holmes, 1986; Holmes, 1990; Levine, 1992) advocates the PDS as a strong vehicle for educational change. Darling-Hammond (1998) describes PDSs as spaces where prospective and mentor teacher learning becomes 1) experiential, 2) grounded in teacher questions, 3) collaborative, 4) connected to and derived from teachers' work with their students, and 5) sustained, intensive, and connected to other aspects of school change. The PDS is a place where problems of schooling are posed and solved by teachers. This teacher-centered notion of professional development driven by the unique needs of public school children is supported by the philosophy of PDSs, and supplants the traditional recipes and prescriptions of staff development. The culture of a PDS can create the spaces for "infinitely skilled teachers" who, according to Darling-Hammond (1998):

> Learn best by studying, doing, and reflecting; by collaborating with other teachers; by looking closely at students and their work; and by sharing what they see (p.8).

However, although the PDS has been advocated as a tool for reforming teacher education and schooling, the literature provides little insight into the ways the PDS impacts the participants. Specifically, we know little about mentor teachers' daily work experiences, roles, or the factors that impact their work. After recognizing this lack of attention, I wondered what we could learn from studying the work roles and experiences of mentor teachers in PDSs. Could an account of their work augment our understanding? This study investigates how teachers understand, negotiate, and struggle with their roles as mentors in the context of this PDS. To these ends, I

chose to paint a portrait of six mentor teachers' work. I do not believe that these cases are necessarily representative of all mentor teachers' work in all newly formed PDSs. However, I do believe that they offer insight into the work teachers do as they collaborate in PDS settings with interns and university faculty to enhance education for children.

Background of Study

Over the last four years the Mountainside Elementary School in conjunction with a Research One Institution's Elementary Education program located in the Northeastern United States has been developing a strong school-university partnership which more recently has been actualized as a PDS targeted at reforming the teacher education program and building an inquiry oriented culture.

With the goal of understanding each of these developing mentor teacher roles within the PDS, this study explored three phases in the evolution of this PDS. The first phase explicitly recognized the importance of "teacher as decision maker" and focused on mentor teachers participating in laying the PDS groundwork. For example, teachers developed an intern selection procedure and actively participated in the selection of their year-long interns drawn from a pool of undergraduate prospective teacher applicants. The second phase recognized the importance of developing the role of "teacher as teacher educator." During this phase, the traditional student teaching handbook was discarded and teachers were given the space to create an individual intern plan that met the needs of the intern, classroom teacher, and children. Finally, the PDS work turned to teacher research which sought to develop an inquiry stance as a part of mentor teacher work.

Research Methodology

The interpretive methods (Erickson, 1986) employed for this exploratory case study involved the collection and interpretation of qualitative data over an eighteen month period. A constructivist epistemology (Bruner, 1986) was embodied into the collection and interpretation of this data. The unit of analysis was mentor teachers who were selected using a unique case selection procedure (Goetz and LeCompte, 1984). In this case, the unique attribute was the teachers' collective decision to collaboratively engage in creating an inquiry focused year-long undergraduate internship within a PDS.

The techniques used to enhance the quality of the analysis and ensure trustworthiness of the study include source triangulation, method triangulation, and member checks. Source triangulation required "checking out the consistency of different sources within the same method" (Patton, 1990, p.464). Method triangulation relied on "checking out the consistency of findings generated by different data-collection methods" (Patton, 1990, p. 464). The data sources used in this analysis included: 1) journal entries written by mentors and interns, 2) fieldnotes, 3) interviews, 4) e-mail, 5) meeting minutes, and 6) transcripts from PDS meetings.

Each teacher participated in 2-3 semi-structured interviews focusing on the following three major categories of information: 1) a description of each teacher's motivation and own teacher education experience, 2) a description of the teacher's experiences as a mentor within this PDS, and 3) thoughts associated with the problems and possibilities for their PDSs. The tape recordings of each interview were transcribed, allowing for accurate reporting of the teachers' responses and enabling the researcher to interpret specific responses in the context of the entire transcript. The typical length of the responses was in the form of many paragraphs.

Data across the six participants was examined in order to identify common patterns within the three roles- teacher as participant, teacher as teacher educator, and teacher as inquirer. Additionally, as patterns emerged, I conducted systematic searches of the data, looking for disconfirming and confirming evidence to support the themes that emerged (Erickson, 1986). I also conducted periodic member checks with the teachers, the principal, and other university faculty as part of the analysis. After reviewing the data set multiple times, themes emerged within each of the three phases of PDS development.

In order to provide the reader with rich description, I utilized Wolcott's (1994) methodological structure of description, analysis, and interpretation to share these teachers' work. Thus, the remaining sections of this paper will present a description of the school context, the mentors, the work associated with each phase, and an analysis of issues relevant to mentor work within each phase. To the greatest extent possible and with the highest respect[1] I have chosen to use the mentors' words rather than substitute my own. As a result I use pseudonyms, salient quotes and vignettes from journals, interviews, and observations.

School Description

This small, six classroom, kindergarten through second grade school is nestled on the side of a mountain just outside of a university town. The school's size as well as layout facilitates collaboration among faculty members, paraprofessionals, and support staff. For example, at each grade level, two teachers team with each other and this teaming is supported by organizational structures (e.g., meetings and common planning time) as well as the physical

[1] I would like to thank the six teachers who felt their work and this study were worthwhile enough to make explicit their experiences and their thinking about their work.

connection of the classrooms. Every teacher in this school believes Mountainside is a unique place to teach and share the sentiments evidenced in the following statement:

> We have a social life within our school. The teachers in this school eat together. Our lunch time is the same 45 minutes so we always have time to catch up with each other. It is really informal. But, we are together and we have a chance to talk and laugh. It is a wonderful place to work. It is ideal for the children, the teachers, and the parents. It's such a small school and we are really more like a family. There is a definite sense of community. Parents feel comfortable coming in. Everyone knows the children. We really just make decisions by talking things over. It usually isn't much of a problem. Most of the time we talk it over and the majority sort of rules. We compromise. We talk about everything at lunch, school stuff, home stuff, things that come up during the day. (Beth, Interview, 1-99)

Each of the teachers recognize and value the unique and supportive culture of their school. In fact, throughout the study teachers never mentioned a need for anything to change within their school. As will be discussed later, these teachers are most concerned with preserving rather than altering, this supportive culture that they so deeply value.

Participant Description

These veteran teachers averaged 16 years of classroom teaching experience with a mean age of 44 years. All but one of these teachers highlighted frustration as a central feature of their own student teaching experience. In each case, they cited a nondynamic cooperating teacher who was inflexible and highly traditional as the source of their own frustration in learning to

teach. Although these mentors are each professionally seasoned women, they each bring to their work a unique twist. For example, one teacher is a recertified special education teacher, another is a graduate of an MAT program, and another has held a wide range of reading specialist positions throughout her career. As indicated in the following excerpts, each of the six teachers became involved in the PDS work for very different reasons:

> "I am doing this because I am a new teacher and the principal needed me to participate."
>
> "The only reason I'm doing this is because it is my alternative evaluation."
>
> "I really want more adult hands in my classroom."
>
> "I know it is good for the kids and I enjoy working with the university."
>
> "I think it is good for teacher education."

These motivations influence the mentors' work experiences and the stories that emerge as they work with their interns over the course of this study.

In each of the above cases, the teachers of Mountainside Elementary agreed to participate for different reasons. Interestingly, not one of them mentioned the reasons discussed by Powell and McGowan (1996) in their study of teachers' work in PDSs. Powell and McGowan found that teachers based their decisions to take part in the PDS collaborative on their expectations of greater control over their environment. Additionally, they found teachers hoped the formation of the PDS would provide opportunities for them to assert greater control over their professional growth and that the teachers' desire for control over their environment increased through their participation in the PDS. As indicated in the above biographical sketches, the decision of these six teachers to participate in PDS work ranged from genuine enthusiasm for reform in teacher education to being enticed by the building principal to participate as a part of their teacher

evaluation. However, in looking across the data collected after the PDS work began, two beliefs were commonly held. The six teachers indicate that they believe the internship will benefit children, and they believe the internship could enhance the field experience for prospective teachers.

At this point, it is important to note that one teacher who participated in the conceptualization phase of the PDS work quit her job because she did not feel the space existed for her to grow professionally within this district. She provides this brief biographical sketch and reflection upon her own professional life:

> I began as a kindergarten teacher 23 years ago and I have been learning ever since. The challenge of teaching is important to me because I am always trying to understand the diverse nature of children and the experiences that they bring to school. This leads me to question a lot of what is done in schools, as well as my own abilities to improve schooling for children. I have been fortunate in my work experience to have been engaged in activities that allow for risk taking and provide challenges. I've held a number of specialist positions that I've used as a vehicle for helping other teachers develop professionally, and I've worked with colleagues who in my opinion are the best of the best. When they won't let me teach in ways that I feel respects these children, then it is time to move on.

This teacher's account offers an alternative perspective on teachers' work within this school. Ultimately, this teacher resigned because she did not feel space existed for her to grow professionally. This teacher's experience contributes to our understanding of the existing professional culture of Mountainside Elementary and her questioning of the

professional culture becomes relevant in making sense of the teachers' work experience in each phase of the PDS's evolution.

What follows is a description and analysis of mentor teacher work as they progress through three overlapping phases: teacher as participant, teacher as teacher educator, and teacher as researcher. Although these phases of PDS development are encountered and described sequentially, they are not intended to be discrete entities and in reality are interactive.

Phase One: Teachers as Participants

During this first phase, teachers were introduced to the concept of PDSs and discussed the format for this year-long internship. This work culminated the relationship that had begun four years ago and served as the formal kick-off for the internship. During this initial meeting, the university leadership led the teachers in a discussion centered around the vision for this PDS organized by the three E's: enhancing the educational experience of all children, ensuring a high quality teacher education experience, and engaging teachers in furthering their own professional growth as teacher educators and teachers. As the planning phase continued, the teachers discussed and developed an intern selection and matching procedure. The mentors' work during this early stage consisted of sharing the PDS goals, planning the internship, problem solving, and intern selection. The teachers' work during this phase included discussing PDS issues at staff meetings, meeting potential interns during school visits, reviewing applications, conducting interviews, attending a social gathering to meet future interns, and making the intern-mentor matches. Additionally, three of the six teachers engaged in independent readings about PDSs for university credit.

Although the university and school district leadership used multiple opportunities (inservice time, additional after-school meetings, release time, and at-home work) to engage these teachers in the dialogue and the planning of this PDS work, analysis indicates that the teachers did not feel empowered to meaningfully participate in conceptualizing the internship. Some of the tensions or difficulties encountered include: teachers did not possess a shared vision for simultaneous renewal, teachers silenced themselves, and teachers silenced each other.

Lack of Shared Vision

Proving something doesn't exist and writing about the absence of anything is problematic. In this case, an impression that surfaced in the leadership's conversations was the absence of talk about professional growth and renewal for mentor teachers:

> We talked about ways we hoped the teachers would see the PDS as a vehicle for allowing teachers to participate in meaningful professional exploration and growth. However, it seems like the teachers just don't understand or see the need for renewal. Possibly the teachers don't see a reason to question their practices or engage in renewal. We continue to hope that the renewal piece will come as the teachers begin participating in inquiry and begin asking themselves questions about their practices. (Researcher's journal, 10/98)

Since "renewal" is a component of this PDS as defined by the three E's, the absence of this talk suggests that the professional culture during this first year of the PDS did not include conversation about renewal as a part of their work. In analyzing the mentor teacher biographical data and the mentors' explicit reasons for participating in this work, it becomes readily apparent that none of the teachers committed to PDS work as a vehicle for enhancing their own professional growth. Even when explicitly asked, "How do you see yourself growing

professionally because of your participation?" their answers were limited to the following themes:

> I'll pick up a few ideas from my intern.
>
> It will help me stay fresh.
>
> I'll have a better understanding of my students. (Researcher's journal 9-98)

This type of data suggests that these teachers do not share the vision of renewal. Rather, the majority of these mentors, admirably, based their decision on wanting to better meet the needs of the children in their classrooms. As the year unfolds, it becomes clear that questioning one's practice is not a part of the teachers' culture at this school. As indicated in the description of the school context, these teachers are quite satisfied with their existing work context and are primarily interested in preserving their work culture and sharing this "wonderful" context and their own professional expertise with prospective teachers.

This finding is consistent with Griffin's (1995) assertion that teachers typically do not question their own pedagogical expertise. In fact, as testified by a teacher in Griffin's work:

> We were selected for this work exactly because we are considered to be outstanding teachers. No one has questioned whether we do a good job with students. In fact, we have the reputation of doing really outstanding work. (Griffin, 1995, p. 39)

Teachers often do not define a good teacher as one who questions the work he/she does with children. Thus, maybe the idea of teachers talking about how their participation in the PDS will enhance their own learning or enhance the learning of their students is not a "developmentally appropriate" expectation based on the existing teaching culture? Do these teachers define a good

teacher as one who questions the work they do with children? At this point, little evidence exists to suggest that these teachers share the PDS vision of school committed to educational reform for all participants.

Silencing Selves

Evidence also exists to demonstrate that teachers silence themselves and need to find their own voices in order to participate in the PDS work. For example, after substantive discussion about the intern selection process, three of the six teachers shared their disappointment in the selection process adopted. This interview process created in a meeting with the mentor teachers, principal, and university leadership, developed as a result of a lengthy discussion with the entire staff sharing their ideas. As a part of this discussion, the principal suggested that the teachers use the same model for interviewing interns that the principals engage in when hiring teachers. Since there was no apparent disagreement, the university leadership felt the decision was mutually accepted (researcher memo, 4-98) and the discussion was closed. Interestingly, as a result of adopting the principal's suggestion, the teachers felt like the interview process was not something that they had created, but rather the work of the principal as evidenced in the following remark:

> This was an autocratic decision made by an autocratic leader to select the interns in this way. (Caran, Expanded field notes, 3-98, 48-49)

Another teacher commented about the principal's impact on the intern interview plan:

> I was upset about the way that the principal controlled the process of how we selected the interns. We wanted it a certain way and then the principal said they did it [hired teachers] a different way and that is what happened. (Lydia, Expanded field notes, 4-28-98, 26-28)

The teachers' comments indicated they did not believe they had a voice in the decision of how to select the interns.

As a researcher, I found this perspective puzzling since in reviewing transcriptions of the "talk," the teachers appeared to approve of the intern selection process adopted. In investigating this issue further, what I found was that the teachers used their voice to discuss possibilities for the internship selection process but did not use their voice to object to the principal's suggestion and defend an alternative idea. Their unwillingness to disagree with the principal made it look like they agreed with the process adopted. It was not until much later that the university leadership recognized that the teachers did not feel comfortable with the selection process. At that time, other issues emerged that indicated the teachers had trouble sharing their ideas in the presence of authority figures.

Teachers Silence Each Other

Another critical incidence related to voice occurred as one teacher explored some individual professional interests she would like to try as a part of the PDS work. At this point, the story of voice takes an unexpected twist. These same teachers who were willing to withhold their own voice when their opinions conflicted with the principal ultimately raised their voice to silence a colleague. The discussion that follows illustrates how most teachers were not comfortable with this teacher's interest in challenging some of the existing structures of her classroom practice. The following interaction describes the manner that colleagues reacted to a teacher who was interested in challenging the district curriculum by asking for space to inquire about existing curriculum.

> I'm always talking about inquiry based education- how I'd really like to structure whatever the theme is and have it come from the children. And have lots of

questions. I'd like to take nine weeks and explore that option. How does it work? What are its problems? What kinds of resources are available to me? What's the management aspect? How do I assess? All of these are questions I might have. In my mind I want to do this but I have to try it and massage it. That might be something I would like to try. Would I have the support as long as I met the goals and objectives? Would I have support to do that? (Meeting, 4/98)

Within minutes this teacher's colleagues made the following comments:

What are you going to use for instructional books? Any kind of instructional books have to go through a process to be approved by the board so you're going to have to ask your questions and it is going to take nine weeks to go through this process.

If you were doing a different unit, you would have to have some freedom to select books…

Support? Well, first of all, I think that the first step is going to your principal and saying here is my plan, cause it is an individual type of thing. This is what I would like to do. What do you think about it?

It really affects the book pool too. Cause you have to get it checked out….

Now you are talking about dollars. Okay, I mean if you do an inquiry based unit and one class decides one direction to go and you are going to have to support that unit some way and then another year you go this way.

What about money for materials?

Have you observed this actually work somewhere?

I don't feel imprisoned by the curriculum …. I don't feel that it is constraining.

It sounds like the curriculum is really constraining to you.

> Does that mean the university is going to add funds to support any kind curricular change that we come up with? (Meeting, 4/98)

After this teacher had risked sharing her inquiry idea with her peers she felt unsupported and silenced by her colleagues. She did not participate in the rest of the meeting. In fact as the story plays out, this mentor teacher left the faculty. Ultimately, these teachers demonstrated how teachers could silence each other when they encounter something that is different from the status quo. What seems to be building is a case of contentment with the status quo and the evidence presents barriers to creating a context where the goals of a PDS can be fully realized.

Interestingly, the first role named by Frankes, Valli, and Cooper as teacher as decision–maker becomes more appropriately named in this study as teacher as participant. During this first phase, mentor teachers struggled with defining their own participation. As a result of these emerging barriers, teachers did not immediately see themselves as decision makers within the PDS. Rather, during this early phase they began by struggling with the existing cultural barriers and voicing frustration as they tried to negotiate a way to become participants in the PDS work.

Phase Two: Teachers as Teacher Educators

During this second phase, Teachers becoming Teacher Educators, the mentors began their daily work with their intern. This work included teachers' planning and implementing instruction with interns, providing feedback, completing observations, and attending meetings dedicated to developing PDS roles and responsibilities of mentor teachers. During this phase, the interns worked alongside the teachers and completed twelve credits in math, science, and social studies.

In order to meaningfully engage the interns in the art and science of teaching, mentors also spent substantial time teaching their interns about district curriculum, planning, observing children, assessment, instructional strategies, schools as organizations, and the diverse needs of children. These conversations occurred in a variety of forms including before school and after school, team meetings, phone conversations, seminars, triad journaling (Silva, 2000), and unit planning meetings.

During this phase, the university faculty did not provide the traditional student teacher handbook. Instead, they asked the teachers to engage in developing an individualized plan for their own intern. The teachers were given a general outline of the internship year, the three PDS goals, copies of the coursework syllabi, and the university conceptual framework as tools for creating this individualized intern experience. In addition to their classroom work, these teachers also spoke informally with the building PDA[2] on a weekly basis to discuss, highlight, and troubleshoot their intern's progress:

> Today Lynnete and I sat down and discussed some of Jessica's strengths and weaknesses. I knew that Lynnete had much better insight into these questions because she spent each and every day working with Jessica. Lynnete expressed that she was concerned about classroom management and that she knew that Jessica got very nervous when she taught. Together, we shared our impressions of Jessica's read aloud and brainstormed together ways to help her. We decided that Jessica should do some observations of Lynnete doing a read aloud and then create a rubric of what a good read aloud would look like to her. Next, we would

[2] PDA's are Professional Development Associates who represent the university field experience and work with interns and collaborate with classroom-based teacher educators.

tape Jessica doing a read aloud and then she could use that rubric to assess her own growth in that area. (Researcher Journal, 11-98)

These meetings resulted in university faculty and mentor developing a professional relationship and assuming shared responsibility for intern growth. Finally as a part of the teachers' work during this phase, the teachers also discussed PDS issues at faculty meetings, developed an advisory board, encouraged the development of a mentor teacher resource guide, and presented at intern seminars. The three teachers who enrolled in coursework completed readings in the area of supervision and teacher development.

As a result of the PDS work, a variety of factors influenced the teachers' comfort with becoming a teacher educator. The most promising finding of this stage was that organizing the classroom for instruction by multiple adults was particularly beneficial to incorporating the intern into the classroom.

Organizing For Instruction

The teachers found themselves organizing their classrooms in ways that support mentoring. The following example illustrates the way all of the teachers except one organized their classrooms for instruction:

> I entered the room and immediately noticed the teacher, intern, and paraprofessional engaged in conversation with children. The teacher was helping the child with attendance papers, the intern was working with a child at his desk, and the paraprofessional was talking to the children as they were hanging up their coats…Within minutes, the children were gathered up front on the carpet with the intern while the teacher and paraprofessional each met with individual children at the back of the room. I wondered if the three conversations going on in the room

were distracting to the children, but they all seemed unaffected by the multiple conversations occurring. The intern worked with the majority of the class on the morning opening and followed the opening with a morning letter. During this time, children moved in and out of the full group with ease to work with the paraprofessional and the teacher. As the intern completed the morning letter, the teacher approached the group of children and together she and her intern discussed the morning plans with the children. The children moved quietly to their language arts station and immediately engaged in work. The time on task for children is way beyond what one sees in a regular classroom with a single teacher. At any given moment, there is an adult within an arm's reach of every child. Soon the children were all actively working at their language arts stations. The teacher read with the children at a round table in the back of her room. The paraprofessional worked with children on their writing at the desks near the door in the front of the room. The intern was nestled on the floor working with a group developing sight words. In the technology area at the back of the room, a group of students independently worked on the computers and listened to stories on tape. Each small group of children was actively engaged. After 15 minutes the bell rang and the groups rotated to the next station. These children were ability grouped and the instruction reflected the needs of each group. The children were engaged in an hour of instructional time on task. This was possible because an adult was available at all times. Additionally, the adults at each station kept records about each child's progress during the activity. After centers were completed, the children prepared for recess. At this point, three adults (actually 4

> including myself) were available to button, zip, and help with gloves and boots. Within minutes, this group of first graders headed outside.
>
> When the children came in, they prepared for math. The children gathered for a math opening at the carpet, this time led by the teacher, as the intern and paraprofessional did some preparation for the math stations. The teacher dismissed the children to stations which were taught by the paraprofessional, intern, and teacher. In these stations, children participated in manipulative math activities focused on understanding the concept of subtraction. Once again the time on task for each child seemed substantial and the activity each child engaged in was gauged to the groups instructional level. (Researcher Journal, 10-98)

This type of organizational structure could be found in all but one of the six mentors' classrooms. Evidence indicates that the organizational structure of these classrooms substantively facilitates incorporating the intern into the daily work of teaching. Because children are taught in small groups and because the teachers are committed to providing individual attention, each adult has a meaningful role. This organizational component creates opportunities for intern pedagogical growth, streamlines planning, and facilitates children's learning.

During this phase, the following tensions became readily apparent in the mentor teachers' work: *time, growth for selves, and defining their role as teacher educators.*

Time

Both fieldnotes and mentor excerpts during the first half of the year, indicate that teachers spent more time talking about their daily classroom work than when they teach in isolation. The

following comment acknowledges the type of conversations that are becoming an integral part of the teachers' day:

> Having a full time student means that much of your time during specials and after school is spent talking and explaining procedures and the "why" of what you are doing. (Lydia, Journal response, #5-8, Dec. 1998)

Although Lydia recognizes the utility of these conversations, she considers these conversations between herself and her intern as an "add-on" that was not previously a part of her daily work as a teacher. Lydia believes these conversations only benefit her intern. Beth echoes:

> There is a significant time commitment required by all participants during the first semester. This can be emotionally challenging for both the intern and the mentor. My husband can always judge how much time my work takes by the time he has dinner ready for me. It seems later and later. (Beth, Journal entry, #78-82, Dec. 1998)

Schneider, Seidman, and Cannone (1996) in their study of mentor teachers, also identified time as a serious concern of the teacher. In their study, mentor teachers described an overwhelming workload as they tried to balance classroom planning, work with children, and commitment to interns. Additionally, Schneider, Seidman, and Cannone found that mentors struggled as they interacted daily with a student teacher who was full of doubts. The struggle became especially apparent when the teacher worked with a student who may be at risk for failure. This was a particularly draining experience for these teachers. Similarly, some indication exists that Lydia experiences this same frustration. Lydia struggles with the challenges of her work as a mentor since she has questions regarding her intern's ability as indicated:

> Though having an extra person in the classroom is always good, I think I would have been more frustrated, if it hadn't been for my paraprofessional. We had worked together last year and she knew how we operated. I do need to remember that these students are fresh from the university and have no teaching experience. So I should have no expectations. But I now feel that I should probably look for an intern who displays a bit of initiative, rather than one who sits and waits for all instructions. (Lydia, Journal response, #28-35, Dec. 1998)

This intern's inability to navigate the classroom without constant direction has contributed to Lydia's frustration and led to her viewing her intern as a "time drainer."

Growth for Self

Betsy's thoughts about the "talk" and time necessary when working with an intern suggests an alternative viewpoint that was consistent with the majority of the mentors:

> Throughout the semester, I have had an opportunity to verbalize and process my educational philosophy, schedules and routines, management techniques, and educational expectations. After teaching for more than two decades, many of these areas are performed automatically, but it has been good to be given the chance to articulate the "whys" of the important areas in working with a roomful of eager learners. (Betsy, Journal response, #8-12, Dec. 1998)

This reflection indicates that Betsy and other teachers are beginning to believe they grow professionally as they talk with their interns. They are experiencing growth through their discourse with their interns and this growth is becoming something which they value. Although the mentor role is not without costs, satisfaction from mentoring exists and becomes an early

indicator of a change in school culture that indicates teachers benefit from interacting with their intern.

This supports the work of Schneider, Seidman, and Cannone (1996) who found that mentors experienced a sense of renewal when they had the opportunity to talk with colleagues breaking down their traditional sense of isolation. Similarly, Bullough et al. (1997) in their study indicate that teachers become increasingly reflective about teaching when they work with interns over an extended period of time. One teacher described her growth:

I think the greatest benefit for me was that I really learned what and how I teach because I had to explain my method. It was really self analysis. I would do something that was successful and I would have to say, "Now, why did that work?" (Bullough et al, 1997, p. 158)

These types of reflections suggest that teachers are developing a professional culture which includes inquiring into their own practice.

Becoming a Teacher Educator

Throughout this first semester of working with their intern, the teachers struggle to define their own role and responsibility for intern emotional and pedagogical growth. One teacher describes the following tension:

> One insight I gained from watching Janet the other day, reminded me that lately we have gotten away from our talks and why we are doing what we are doing… I think one of the most important things a mentor teacher needs to do is explain why the lesson you are teaching is important at that time, what you have done to prepare the children so they are ready for that lesson, and then to think about what needs to follow...and I would like her to give me something to look for as she

> teaches so she begins to be more critical and thinking about improving her lessons. (Lydia, Journal response, #53-56 & #61-63, Dec. 1998)

Lydia is constructing her own understanding of her role as mentor as she watches her intern struggle with issues of planning and teaching. Another teacher in her reflections on the first half of the year, highlights the need for a resource guide to help both interns and mentors understand their responsibilities during the year-long internship. Beth suggests:

> Teachers need to have an idea of what to expect from their interns at each stage of the school year. (Beth, Journal response #74-77, Dec. 1998)

This call for a resource guide came quite loudly from three of the six teachers and the principal asked the university to respond. In collaboration with the building principal, the university faculty developed a loosely defined continuum of prospective teacher goals that provided a framework for mentor planning. Although the mentors had asked for a structure to help them understand their role and responsibilities as typically offered in traditional student teaching field experiences, what was ultimately crafted was a set of developmental expectations for their interns' work within their classroom. At this point the teachers began to clarify their work and ethos about mentoring. In taking away the traditional student teaching assessments provided by the university, the teachers shifted their role from supportor to assuming the responsibility for intern growth and development.

Interestingly, not all of the teachers were anxious to have a resource guide. Some indicated that from the onset they valued the flexibility they had in creating an appropriate experience for their intern and assuming roles traditionally associated with university structured teacher education:

> I actually feel really badly that we have now created all of these guidelines for the internship. I valued the flexibility and the freedom to adjust the experience to the needs of my intern rather than feeling driven by guidelines. I think too many of us become technicians of the work. I also believe that everyone is caught up in the fact that all the interns' experiences won't look the same. And that will make them feel that they are not doing it right. (Caran, Interview #1, p.13, #10-17)

Caran demonstrates her lack of enthusiasm for the guidelines because she values the freedom associated with developing an individual experience for her own intern. Caran comments indicate her interest in specifically planning and structuring activities for her intern's growth.

Although Caran's comments are the most clear in illustrating the role shift from mentor to teacher educator, evidence exists that these teachers have begun to move in this same direction:

> Betsy made arrangements for Amy to work one day a week with a fifth grade teacher at Park City. Betsy initiated the request because she believed Annie would benefit by teaching in another grade. She followed through by assuming the responsibility of finding a placement for her. I felt excited that Betsy had made this happen for her intern. (Researcher Journal, Jan. 1999)

> Lynnete did a dynamite job of setting up a number of observations for Susan. She knows Susan's strengths and weaknesses so well that she can think of teachers that she knows who would be really good for Susan to observe and talk with. (Researcher Journal, Jan. 1999)

I find it exciting to see how the relationships and roles have developed between the intern and the teacher. One thing that comes to mind as I write this entry is the number of times that Kelly has suggested journal topics for Megan to write about. Kelly is feeling like she is a teacher

"providing meaningful assignments" rather than just a supportive person providing Megan with a space to learn her teaching techniques. (Researcher Journal, Jan. 1999)

Because of Sheri's work on the advisory board, Beth has had to jump into uncharted territory. Typically in the student teaching process, preservice teachers don't have the opportunity to learn about leadership and feel the tensions that are often involved in speaking on behalf of others. Sheri demonstrates such clear leadership potential and Beth has worked to nurture and develop that potential as a part of her work with Sheri. (Researcher Journal, Dec. 1999)

Interestingly, in the end of the first semester interview four of the six teachers identified themselves as "teacher educators" responsible for implementing an appropriate educational plan for their intern. Stanulis (1995) in her study of teachers in PDSs identified three themes that relate to this concept of "teachers as teacher educators." Teachers focused on developing independent thinkers, worked with interns to connect theory with best practices, and helped interns connect subject matter to children. Teitel (1997) also identified that working in the PDS gave teachers an active role in providing feedback on shaping university courses and the overall preparation of interns in university teacher education programs. This work, in conjunction with the work of Teitel and Stanulis, suggests that the PDS provides the stimulus to move beyond mentor to include the role of teacher educator. These teachers are coming to understand what becoming a teacher educator means to their work in a PDS.

Changes for Children

As indicated in the description of a typical classroom, children experience a heightened amount of time on task. The teachers have actually altered the ways they structure and interact with the children in their classrooms because they recognize and value an extra set of hands:

> This classroom is organized into small group centers as frequently as possible. The children rotate through four language arts centers for a portion of their language arts program.... During times I have full group instruction, the intern can work one-on-one with students who need a little more academic assistance, finish a project, or offer a more challenging activity for the advanced student. Likewise, when my intern is teaching the class, it offers me the opportunity to work individually with students. (Betsy, Journal response, #23-25 & 35-28, Dec. 1998)

Similarly, with an additional adult in the classroom students tend to be on-task more often than otherwise.

> There is always someone available to refocus a child's attention on the task at hand... With more adults, all students have had the opportunity to create, edit, and publish at least one story so far. This is the first time we have been able to accomplish this so early in the year. (Beth, Journal response, #47-55, Dec. 1998)

Betsy also believes that having an intern in her room has contributed to greater understanding of her students as well:

> It has been my benefit to have another set of professional eyes watching our students and determining adjustments as needed. My intern and I are able to conference with each other concerning observations of specific learners...I feel like I know my students better this year, because I have had more individual time with them, as well as a valued colleague to discuss important aspects of the learning of each student. (Betsy, Journal response, #27-28 & #38-40, Dec. 1998)

This sentiment is shared across this cohort of teachers. They believe the work of the PDS contributes to positive changes for children.

Absence of Methods Faculty

Because the PDS work was attached to math, science, and social studies methods courses, the mentors developed strong feelings about the role of university methods' faculty in the PDS. During this first year, the integration of the coursework was incomplete and challenging for all participants. This lack of integration between university developed courses and the PDS led to a number of challenges as evidenced in the mentor teachers' talk. The teachers often stated that the university faculty should come to work in their classrooms.

> The professors should come into my classroom. I would love it if the science faculty would come in and take all of the interns and work with them on some science concept. They could then move from kindergarten to first grade and so on…That is what a PDS should be. But there is no meeting with the professors and us. I feel like it is still the university and us. We are separate. We do our thing and they do theirs. (Interview, Lydia, #28-35, 9-98)

These teachers were particularly interested in the math, science, and social studies faculty teaching in a "real" classroom setting. Most of the data indicates that this suggestion was made frequently but that during this first year little effort to develop these relationships was extended by either party due to time constraints. However, teachers believed this would help the interns bridge theory and practice. One teacher wanted to have a faculty member help the teacher explore mathematics in her classroom:

> I'd like him (faculty) to come in and help me redo my math. I don't like the way I do math at all, and I really need to make some changes. But do you think he

could really help me with that (making classroom changes)? Do you think he can work with kids? (Researcher Journal, 12-98)

This teacher contemplates inquiry with a faculty member to investigate the organization of mathematics instruction in her classroom. The inquiry question that she poses deals more with classroom management than exploring content, pedagogy, or pedagogical content knowledge. Additionally although the university has provided many additional field based resources, at this point the resources to support collaboration with methods faculty were not yet in place. Until teachers and university faculty have the time, intellectual space, and readiness to explicitly explore the connection between theory and practice, this depth of collaboration is unlikely.

Similarly, Bullough et al. (1997) indicated little change in teachers' views about teacher education. Teachers suggested that theory was unrelated to their own experiences and had only limited worth. They stressed the primacy of practical experience as indicated in the following comment:

They have all these new ideas that they have read out of a book, but it is really not going to work. I can think of many student teachers who come and say, "Oh, we are going to start this and we are going to do that." But it is not reality; let's put them in reality and step on it. (Bullough et al., 1997, p. 158)

Bullough et al. (1997) also noted that even after teachers had worked in PDSs for five or six years, little evidence of change occurred in the teachers' views of teacher education or the interactive nature of theory and practice. A shared perspective of teachers and university faculty had not developed, suggesting that aspects of the PDS program that extend beyond preparation of teachers may have less appeal or relevance for teachers. Additionally, they found mentors' conceptions of PDSs as simplistic, as evidenced in statements like "Its goals are to better prepare

teachers with the real world kinds of things rather than just the kinds of things that (teacher candidates) are exposed to in a college situation." Most teachers described the PDS as a place to "train teachers."

In the case of Mountainside Elementary, the goals of mentors sharing the work of teacher education will most likely not be actualized unless vehicles are created for developing these connections. Possible vehicles that could support shared responsibility, renewal, and the connection of theory and practice include building strong relationships between partners, gaining insight into each other's thinking about teaching, and developing a common discourse for renewal. Until these vehicles are in place, this issue will continue to be a barrier to building an inquiry-oriented culture and expanding mentors' roles to include responsibility for teacher education.

Phase Three: Teachers as Researchers

During this third phase, Teachers as Researchers, mentors engaged in some form of inquiry. Specifically, these teachers chose from the following three levels of involvement in inquiry: 1) engaging in own inquiry parallel to the intern, 2) collaborating with the intern on an inquiry question, or 3) assuming a supportive role in inquiry with the onus of the responsibility for inquiry on the intern. As a part of their preparation for inquiry, the mentors read the Hubbard and Powers (1993) text on teacher inquiry, attended an in-service which provided examples of teacher research, brainstormed ideas for teacher research, formed research questions, and developed a timeline for their work.

It is important to note that all of the interns were required to engage in inquiry as a part of their university course expectations and one of the requirements to become a mentor was a willingness to engage in one of the three levels of inquiry. After a full day inservice dedicated to

inquiry, all six mentors elected to participate in the supportive role where the intern bore the responsibility for the inquiry work and the mentor helped to provide ideas for inquiry, question focusing, time, and data collection.

Three salient points emerge from the mentors' work: 1) Mentors seeking to understand what inquiry is and how it is a part of their work as a teacher? 2) Mentors learning about inquiry through observation, and 3) Mentors recognizing inquiry as a professional development tool for interns.

What is Inquiry?

From the onset mentors sought to understand the scope and purpose of inquiry. The mentors at Mountainside initially struggled with the notion of teacher inquiry. They wondered:

> What is inquiry?
>
> Don't we already do this without it being so formal?
>
> How can we call inquiry something that we already do?
>
> I thought inquiry was different, a university thing.

These are some of the questions teachers initially wrestled with as they learned about teacher research. Additionally, comments like the following suggested the mentor teachers were not clear about the purpose or process of inquiry:

> I know my student teacher did this huge inquiry project. I am just not sure if it was derogatory towards me. She missed the fact that we were trying to get him into special education. We tried to get him ritalin. We spent hours. I read her [inquiry] report once and I didn't know how to take it. The bottom line of her inquiry was that he didn't do well in the classroom…umm… no kidding…. She spent an awful lot of time on it for something that might be obvious. I am not

> sure exactly. I don't know how to take it. That was a whole half of a year where maybe we could have done some mini research projects... (Lydia, informal interview, 4-9-98, 83-90)

In a discussion months later, this same teacher makes the following comment:

> How can this be an inquiry project? This is our job as teachers. This is part of the Instructional Support Team process. How can you call this research? (Lydia, informal interview, 1-99)

This teacher has difficulty defining herself as a researcher in her classroom and viewing research as a daily part of her work as a teacher.

On the other hand, three of the six mentors shared thoughts about inquiry being a part of what they do each day in the classroom:

> I think inquiry is something we do all the time in our classroom in a less formal manner. We are always having questions about our kids and trying new strategies to meet their needs. I just think that we don't take or have the time to formally study our teaching and share it with others. (Caran, informal interview, 2-99)

This teacher recognizes the parallels between good teaching and inquiry. She also acknowledges the heightened role of sharing one's professional thinking which is a key piece of influencing the development of an inquiry oriented school culture.

This phase also suggests that a powerful way for mentors to learn about inquiry is through observing the interns. This offers a new twist on mentor professional development since in this study observing the intern's engagement in the process of inquiry over time became a powerful teaching tool for the mentors. At the beginning of the inquiry phase, one teacher showed her concern by asking:

Can it [the inquiry project] be a joint effort?" and this comment was followed by another teacher nodding as she said, "Yeah, we could work together." As these comments were made, lots of teachers nodded and smiled as if relieved about not approaching this task alone. Clearly, the mystery of what an inquiry project is may be contributing to the trepidation experienced by the teachers. (field note, 1-28-98).

Supporting data suggests that these teachers were concerned with finding the time to conduct the inquiry work and were less than confident about their own ability to engage in the work. Most of the trepidation seemed to center around how the inquiry work would be shared with others and the concern was voiced as "Will we have to write a paper?"

Observation as a Tool for Understanding Inquiry

The most substantial learning about inquiry for the mentors was not a result of the inservice or the readings. Rather, learning for the mentors occurred as they observed their own intern develop inquiry questions, collect data, make sense of data, and present their findings at a PDS inquiry conference held at the end of the school year. In fact, the inquiry work often became a focus of mentor/intern discussion during this phase of the internship and depending on the inquiry question heightened particular types of talk. For example, three of the inquiry questions focused on the needs of particular children, two of the inquiry questions investigated the kindergarten writing table, and one inquiry question explored the intern's own questioning practices. After reflecting on the experience, mentors shared the following beliefs about inquiry:

> It was very helpful to see how the interns developed their research questions, data collection process, and conclusions. As a growing classroom teacher, their topics

and findings served as reminders of my goals tied to my practices. All of the interns were knowledgeable and professional. It was an excellent experience.

Based on this type of excerpt, the mentors were able to develop an understanding of the process and power of inquiry by supporting their interns throughout the year. Additionally, this mentor believes connections exist between inquiry and her own role as a classroom teacher. As a result of witnessing the process of inquiry, mentors began constructing their own understanding of the work of a teacher researcher.

Inquiry Benefits Interns

Finally, as a result of witnessing the interns inquiry process, mentors believed that inquiry was important to intern development. In a survey completed at the end of the year, mentors indicated that they strongly agreed with the following statements regarding inquiry:

The inquiry project that was conducted in my classroom this year had a positive impact on my intern's development as a teacher.

I believe that inquiry is an important component of intern's growth and development as teachers.

I believe that inquiry contributed to my continuing professional growth.

As indicated by the end of the internship year, these mentors believed that inquiry added to the professional development of their interns and contributed to their own professional growth.

What about the mentors engaging in furthering their own professional growth through inquiry ? Inquiry into professional practice was never a part of the teachers' professional culture from the onset of the PDS. As indicated, at the beginning of their participation these teachers

were so satisfied with their school that they saw little apparent reason for them to challenge themselves professionally.

Rushcamp and Roehler (1992) noted in their study of PDS teachers that the nature, direction, and pace of change needed to evolve from the teachers. They found that as the teachers began to participate in lengthy discussions related to substantive issues about teaching and learning, the teachers set a course of action. As inquiry becomes a more embedded in PDS discussions, teachers in this PDS may begin to challenge their own assumptions "that there is little need for change in their work."

Reflections

What did I learn about mentor teachers in a PDS? Each of the three phases has provided a deeper insight into the work life of teachers. In the first phase, teachers as participants, teachers were not committed to the renewal piece of the "vision" and teachers were not always comfortable using their voices. However, these same teachers who wished to not be silenced by authority, silenced colleagues to protect their established ways of doing business. Two lessons become apparent from studying the teachers in this phase. First, those interested in initiating PDS work must continuously help others construct a deep understanding of the notion of simultaneous renewal with all participants in the PDS. Second, we must encourage teachers become teacher leaders by learning to use their voices and listen to others' voices in productive ways as they navigate their work both inside and outside of their classrooms.

In the second phase, teachers as teacher educators, we see teachers' work changing in meaningful ways as they incorporate an intern into the classroom. Teachers indicate that they begin to grow professionally as they dialogue with their intern. In this phase, we also begin to

see a broadening of the mentor role to include the role of teacher as teacher educator. As this role shift develops, we will have to help teachers dig deeply to understand and construct meaning about what being a teacher educator means in a PDS. Who is responsible for prospective teacher growth? How should we share and overlap roles between school and university-based teacher educators? How does being a school-based teacher educator impact on a teacher's own professional growth?

In terms of teacher inquiry, the story has just begun. These mentors began to develop an understanding of the process and purpose of teacher inquiry. However, in reviewing their work, mentors observing and supporting their intern's work becomes an effective tool for familiarizing teachers with the inquiry process and the power of teacher inquiry. The most pressing questions raised by this study do not center around what the inquiry project will be or how it will be conducted, but rather how can inquiry eventually become a part of what these women do as teachers and teacher educators?

Frankes, Valli, and Cooper (1998), in a review of research on PDSs, discuss four roles mentors assume as they participate in PDS work. These roles are teacher as decision-maker, teacher as teacher educator, teacher as researcher, and teacher as political activist. In this same review, Frankes et al. conclude that the critical role of teacher as researcher has not developed to the same extent as the roles of teacher as teacher educator and teacher as decision-maker. Since these roles are interconnected, the absence of any one of these roles becomes problematic (Dana, 1998). In an effort to develop each of these roles, during the first year of the PDS an effort was made to engage teachers in developing and defining their work within each role.

In writing this piece, I am reminded that the most important story within this text is that teachers make the difference. Although all participants in this partnership worked collaboratively, the people who determine the success of this educational reform effort are the teachers. Without them, there will be no reflection, there will be no growth, there will be no change, and the PDS will be in name only. This is something I knew from the start but had somehow forgotten. I know from personal practical knowledge based on many years of classroom experience that change happens only when it is consistent with teachers' beliefs. But I had somehow forgotten the importance of this simple fact as I became immersed in the challenges of the work, the sophistry of educational reform, the politics of organizations at work, and my own personal vision of what it means to engage in powerful professional practice.

Although we have learned a great deal about teachers' work, struggles, and beliefs in an emerging PDS, many questions remain. For example, how do teachers understand the notions of renewal and co-reform? Do these teachers believe anything needs reformed? How do teachers conceive of a "well-prepared" teacher? How will these teachers model these qualities for their interns? What is an ideal PDS? How do these teachers envision working with their colleagues so that they can grow professionally? How do these teachers see their own development being helped by their participation in PDS work? What needs will these teachers suggest deserve attention next year? After completing this analysis, these are still questions that deserve attention.

This story remains far from complete. The goal of engaging teachers in furthering their own professional growth through renewal and inquiry sets this professional development school apart from many others. Teachers must have the space and interest in participating, teaching prospective teachers, and inquiring if reform-oriented teaching is going to occur. This story

demonstrates that those interested in creating a PDS culture must recognize that change takes time and requires teachers to build a shared vision, assume responsibility for teacher education, and recognize the power of inquiry. To do this work, vehicles for risk-taking, questioning, communication must be in place and a heightened level of trust must exist. These are clearly factors that will take time to develop and are needed to move this work from rhetoric to reality. Real change takes time.

References

Bentley, M. (1993, November). Constructivism and the new reform paradigm. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the National Council of the Social Studies, Nashville, TN.

Bruner, J. 1986). Actual minds possible worlds. Cambridge, MA.: Harvard University Press.

Bullough, R.V., Kauchak, D. Crow, N.A., Hobbs, S. & Stokes, D. (1997). PDSs: Catalysts for Teacher and School Change. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 13* (2), 153-169.

Dana, N.F., Dana, T.M., & Hernandez, D. (1997). Stages in the evolution of a school university collaborative/ The Mountainside elementary school experience. Pennsylvania Educational Leadership, 17(1), 30-37.

Darling-Hammond, L. (1998). Teacher learning that supports student learning. *Educational Leadership, 55(5), 6-11.*

Darling-Hammond, L. (1994). Professional development schools: Schools for a developing profession. New York: Teachers College Press.

Erickson, F. (1986). Qualitative methods in research on teaching. In M. Wittrock (Ed.), Handbook of research on teaching. (3rd ed., pp.3-36). New York: Macmillan.

Fleury, S.C. (1993, November.). Trivial constructivism and the politics of social knowledge. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting for the National Council of the Social Studies, Nashville, TN.

Frankes, Valli, & Cooper (1998).

Fullan, M. (1994). Teacher leadership: A failure to conceptualize. In D.R. Walling (ed.), *Teachers as Leaders: Perspectives on the professional development of teachers*. Bloomington, IN: Phi Delta Kappan.

Fullan, M.G. (1991). *The new meaning of change*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Goetz, J., and LeCompte, M. (1984). *Ethnography and qualitative design in educational research*. San Diego: Academic Press.

Hargreaves, A (1994). *Changing Teachers, changing times*. New York: Teachers College Press.

Holmes Group (1986). Tomorrow's teachers. East Lansing, MI: Author.

Goodlad, J.I. (1994). *Educational Renewal: Better Teachers, Better Schools*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Levine, M. (1997). Educating Teachers for Restructured Schools. In F.B. Murray (ed.), *The Teacher Educator's Handbook: Building a Knowledge Base for the Preparation of Teachers*, pp. 620-647. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lortie, D.C. (1975). Schoolteacher: A sociological study. London: The University of Chicago Press.

Merriam, S. (1988). *Case study research in education: A qualitative approach*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Patton, M.Q. (1990). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods*. Newbury Park: Sage Publications.

Powell, J.H. & McGowan, T.M. (1996). In Search of Autonomy: Teachers' Aspirations and Expectations from a School-University Collaborative. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12* (3), 249-260.

Rushcamp, S. & Roehler, L.R. (1992). Characteristics Supporting Change in a PDS. *Journal of Teacher Education, 43* (1), 19-27.

Schneider, H., Seidman, I., & Cannone, P. (1996). Ten Steps to Collaboration: The Story of a PDS. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 12* (3), 260-187.

Stanulis, R.N. (1995). Classroom Teachers as Mentors: Possibilities for Participation in a PDS. *Teaching and Teacher Education, 11* (4), 331-344.

Stanulis, R.N., & Jeffers, L. (1995). Action research as a way of learning about teaching in a mentor/student teacher relationship. Action in Teacher Education, 16(4), 14-24.

Teitel, L. (1997). Changing Teacher Education through PDS Partnerships: A Five-year Follow-up. *Teachers College Record, 99* (2), 311-334.

Wolcott, H. (1994).

Table 1 Themes Associated with Teacher Role Development Within the PDS

Teacher Becoming Participant	Teacher Becoming Teacher Educator	Teacher Becoming Inquirer
1. Lack of shared vision 2. Silencing selves 3. Teachers silence each other	1. Organizing the context for shared instruction 2. Making time for professional dialogue 3. Recognizing growth for selves 4. Defining what it means to be a classroom based teacher educator 5. Noticing absence of methods faculty in schools	1. What is inquiry? 2. Observation as a tool for understanding inquiry 3. Inquiry benefits interns

Table 2 Assertions for Facilitating Change

Teacher Becoming Participant	Teacher Becoming Teacher Educator	Teacher Becoming Inquirer
Teachers need time to develop a shared vision of the work and PDS partners need to find ways to support and facilitate the development of a shared vision. Teachers need support as they learn to participate. They need to understand that the context is changing and that new forms of dialogue and participation are a part of the new work.	Teachers need time to reshape their own context and practice to incorporate the PDS resources and find ways to capitalize on the multiple participants. Teachers need to have the space to define what it means to be a classroom based teacher educator. Teachers want to work with methods faculty in schools as relationships develop.	Teachers need time to develop an understanding of inquiry. Teachers can learn how to inquiry and the power of inquiry by observing their intern's engagement in the inquiry process. Teachers see the power of inquiry as they observe.